

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RAYMOND ALEXANDER,

Plaintiff

vs.

JIM FORR, et al.,

Defendants

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:CV-04-0370
(CHIEF JUDGE VANASKIE)

ORDER

NOW, THIS 9th DAY OF AUGUST, 2005, having carefully considered *pro se* plaintiff's appeal from Magistrate Judge Malachy E. Mannion's Order of July 26, 2005, deeming plaintiff's motion to compel discovery as withdrawn for failure to file a memorandum of law in support thereof as required by Local Rule of Court 7.5; and discerning no error of fact or law in the challenged Order,¹ **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. Magistrate Judge Mannion's Order of July 26, 2005 (Dkt. Entry 50) is **AFFIRMED**.

s/ Thomas I. Vanaskie

Thomas I. Vanaskie, Chief Judge
Middle District of Pennsylvania

¹Although a cover letter accompanying plaintiff's discovery motion stated that a memorandum of law accompanied the motion, the record in this case does not contain such a supporting memorandum of law. Plaintiff, of course, may re-file his motion to compel discovery, but must submit a supporting memorandum of law in order to trigger the responsibility of the defendants to file opposition papers.

